

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/760,674	<b>Applicant(s)</b> NOSE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Bernard Krasnic	<b>Art Unit</b> 2624	

**All Participants:**
**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

 (1) Bernard Krasnic (Examiner).

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

 (2) Mr. Remus F. Fetea (Reg. No. 59,140).

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 19 September 2007
**Time:** 2:00pm
**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1-2, 5, 8-9, 12, 15-16, 19, 22-23, and 26

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**
**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Bernard Krasnic

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner initiated a call to the Applicant's attorney, Mr. Fetea, in order to offer an Examiners Amendment to expedite prosecution [The Examiner initiated the first call on Sept. 12 2007 and had contact with Mr. Fetea until Sept. 19 2007]. The Examiner suggested incorporating dependent claim 5 into independent claim 1, and canceling dependent claim 2 because if claims 1 and 5 were to be combined, dependent claim 2 no longer would be further limiting. Similarly, the Examiner suggested incorporating dependent claim 12 into independent claim 8, and canceling dependent claim 9 because if claims 8 and 12 were to be combined, dependent claim 9 no longer would be further limiting. Similarly, the Examiner suggested incorporating dependent claim 19 into independent claim 15, and canceling dependent claim 16 because if claims 15 and 19 were to be combined, dependent claim 16 no longer would be further limiting. Similarly, the Examiner suggested incorporating dependent claim 26 into independent claim 22, and canceling dependent claim 23 because if claims 22 and 26 were to be combined, dependent claim 23 no longer would be further limiting. The Examiner also suggested correcting some minor claim and abstract formality issues. Mr. Fetea also asked if the other dependent species were going to be allowed, wherein the Examiner answered "no" because the suggested amendment towards the independent claims would no longer keep the independent claims generic but influence them toward being of elected Species I. Mr. Fetea understood the Examiner's interpretation and on September 19 2007, had the Applicants permission to go through with the Examiner's Amendment. The attached fax [received from Mr. Fetea on September 19 2007] is the claim language which was agreed upon by both the Examiner and the Applicant. .